

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 10/676,258 | 10/02/2003 | Junichi Miyano | OKI 384 | 3480 |
| 23995 75 | 590 02/13/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| RABIN & Berdo, PC | | | CHEN, BRET P | |
| 1101 14TH STI | REET, NW | | ADTIBUT | PAPER NUMBER |
| SUITE 500 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | 1762 | |
| | | | DATE MAIL ED: 02/13/2000 | 6 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | · • | 5 | | | |
|---|---|---|--|-------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | | 10/676,258 | MIYANO ET AL. | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | B. Chen | 1762 | | | | |
| Period f | The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply | pears on the cover sheet w | ith the correspondence address - | - | | | |
| WHI - Exte afte - If No - Fail Any | HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI , cause the application to become A | ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communica BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1)🖂 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 De | <u>ecember 2005</u> . | | | | | |
| 2a)⊠ | ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| 3)[| Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under E | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C. | D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| : Disposit | tion of Claims | · | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ | Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| , | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) | Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ | Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | r election requirement. | | | | | |
| Applicat | tion Papers | | • | | | | |
| 9)[| The specification is objected to by the Examine | r. | | | | | |
| - | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce | | by the Examiner. | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | | | | |
| | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | ion is required if the drawing | ı(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12 | 1(d). | | | |
| 11) | The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | aminer. Note the attache | d Office Action or form PTO-152 | • | | | |
| Priority : | under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: | priority under 35 U.S.C. | § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents | s have been received. | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents | s have been received in A | Application No | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior | | received in this National Stage | | | | |
| | application from the International Bureau | • | | | | | |
| 7 3 | See the attached detailed Office action for a list | of the certified copies not | received. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Attachmer | nt(s) | • | | | | | |
| | ce of References Cited (PTO-892) | | Summary (PTO-413) | | | | |
| | ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | | s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| | er No(s)/Mail Date | 6) Other: | | | | | |

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. Amended claims 1-2 and newly added claims 5-6 are noted.

The amendment dated 12/6/05 has been entered and carefully considered. In view of said amendment, the objection to the specification and the previous 112 rejection have been withdrawn. In addition, in view of the properly filed Terminal Disclaimer, the obviousness double patenting rejection has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 5, the term "the vacuum ultraviolet rays photons" lack antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (6,130,118) for the reasons listed in the previous office action.

Amended claim 1 and newly added claim 5 requires a specific temperature and energy and wavelength. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have determined the optimum value of a cause effective variable such as temperature, energy and wavelength through routine experimentation in the absence of a showing of criticality.

With respect to newly added claim 6, the applicant requires a specific uv generator. This issue has been addressed in the previous office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/06/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant first argues that the reference fails to teach the appropriate temperature (p.5 issue 1). This newly added limitation has been addressed above.

Applicant next argues that the reference fails to teach an ultraviolet rays generator which provides UV at a shorter wavelength and higher energy which allows them to cause chemical reactions (p.5 issue 2). Applicant cites an Encyclopedia to show that the wavelengths and energies are different and thus cannot break the Si-N bonds.

The examiner agrees in part. While the examiner concedes that wavelengths and energies are different as mentioned by the Encyclopedia reference, the examiner takes issue with some of the arguments. It is first noted that applicant argues that the UV source of Yamazaki cannot break the Si-N bonds. However, nowhere in the instant claims does the applicant require the breaking of Si-N bonds. Hence, the applicant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with the instant claims as presently written. Secondly, even if the energies and wavelengths are

Art Unit: 1762

different, independent claim 1 only requires an UV rays generator. Yamazaki, the applied reference, clearly teaches a UV source which is broad enough to read on a UV rays generator. To that end, however, if the applicant were to amend independent claim 1 to recite breaking Si-N bonds with the energy and wavelength recited in claim 5, this art rejection will be withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not deemed persuasive.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1762

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to B. Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1417. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bc 2/7/06

BRET CHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER